



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/283,958	04/01/99	RAYMOND	R 98-075-TAP

WM21/1001
TIMOTHY R SCHULTE
STORAGE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION
2270 SOUTH 88TH STREET
MS 4309
LOUISVILLE CO 80028-4309

EXAMINER

LETSCHER, G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2652

DATE MAILED:

10/01/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 14

Application Number: 09/283,958
Filing Date: 4/1/99
Appellant(s): Raymond et al

Mr. Mark Chuey
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to appellant's brief on appeal filed 9/19/01.

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

Art Unit: 2652

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

An amendment after final has been filed and entered on 5/31/01.

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 50-82 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

Art Unit: 2652

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

5,978,188	Kaaden et al	11-1999
5,274,521	Miyauchi et al	12-1993
EP 0727772	Gray et al	8-1996

(10) Grounds of Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that

Art Unit: 2652

the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 50-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray et al (EP 727772) in view of Kaaden et al (US 5,978,188) and Miyauchi et al (US 5,274,521).

The aforementioned claims set forth the following features, inter alia, disclosed in Gray et al '772: a magnetic recording head having a plurality of thin film elements (see Fig. 2), each element having a yoke with front and back regions alternately positioned on each side of a position line (Fig. 2 shows it on both sides & also shown in Kaaden Fig. 1), each yoke formed on a substrate (100); a position line normal to the media direction between the write elements; each gap of the thin film elements having a gap angle with the position line and opposite the gap angle of the adjacent gap angle (Fig. 2); a conductive coil (212, 220) having a plurality of loops, each loop having a portion passing within the yoke and encircling the lower yoke section (256); see Figures 2, 5 and 7 of Gray

Art Unit: 2652

et al '772. Kaaden et al '188 disclose a magnetic head assembly (5) having a first plurality of write elements (7) having their back regions on a first side of a position line, e.g., matrix (8), and a second plurality of write elements (7) on a second side of the position line opposite the first side. See Figures 1-2 of Kaaden et al '188 which shows the position (matrix) lines having write elements on either side of the line which splits the head write elements; see Figures 2, 5 and 7 of Gray et al '772.

Regarding claims 50, 62 and 71, Gray et al '772 do not teach a first plurality of write elements having their back regions on a first side of a position line and a second plurality of write elements on a second side of the position line opposite the first side.

Regarding claims 53, 55, 65 and 79-80, Gray et al '772 do not show a flux sensing read element being located between the yokes of the head.

Kaaden et al '188 disclose a magnetic head assembly (5) having a first plurality of write elements (7) having their back regions on a first side of a position line, e.g., matrix (8), and a second plurality of write elements (7) on a second side of the position line opposite the first side. See Figures 1-2 of Kaaden et al '188 which shows the position (matrix) lines having write elements on either side of the line which splits the head write elements.

Art Unit: 2652

Miyauchi et al '521 show a magnetic head having a read element (36) which is within the yoke (53) beneath the gap.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to furnish the magnetic head assembly of Gray et al '772 with a flux sensing read element being located between the yokes of the head as shown in Miyauchi et al '521. The rationale is as follows: one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to furnish a flux sensing read element being located between the yokes of the head as shown in Miyauchi et al '521 since one of ordinary skill would have operated the MR portion of the device with good linearity and high sensitivity characteristics.

(11) Response to Argument

On pages 5-6 of the remarks, Appellant alleges there is not a first and second plurality of write elements shown in Gray et al, but rather elements are mirrored. The Examiner points out that "*multiple heads* are ... are situated on a common die 70 as illustrated in Figure 2 (Emphasis added)."

Applicant contends on pages 7-8 that the elements relative to a position line is not shown in Kaaden et al but rather a matrix grid of elements. The Examiner has interpreted the lines as position lines.

Art Unit: 2652

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "George J. Letscher".

GEORGE J. LETSCHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

George J. Letscher

October 1, 2001

Mark Chuey

Brooks and Cushman PC

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor

Southfield, MI 48075